

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 9 and 32-38 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-8, 10-31 and 39-60 were previously withdrawn with traverse and without prejudice as being subject to a restriction requirement. Claims 9 and 32-38 were rejected in the Office action mailed November 30, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as "Office Action"). A completed credit card authorization form is included for the three month extension of time to respond to the Office Action. It is believed that no other fees are due at this time. In view of the following remarks and amendments, applicant respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 9 and 32-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada (U.S. Published Patent Application 2007/0124471) in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 6,529,956). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 32-38 are not obvious in view of the cited reference and are, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for the reasons stated below.

Claims 9 and 32

Harada discloses a request 511 received at the proxy server 502 that contains URL information for a destination web site ([0029], lines 1-8). The proxy server 502 creates and sends a secure data request 514 to the web server 503 ([0043], lines 4-7). The web server 503 then provides a secure data response 515 to the proxy server 502 (Figure 5) which provides a data response 516 to the client/browser (Figure 5). At this point the information exchange is complete. Subsequent requests 517 are processed using the same process or an abbreviated process ([0045], lines 1-8).

First, applicant respectfully submits that Harada does not disclose, teach or suggest a web server that retrieves a universal resource locator (URL) of one or more resources referenced in the requested web page document as recited in claims 9 and 32. In addition, applicant respectfully submits that Harada does not disclose, teach or suggest retrieving resource access right data for each resource URL referenced in the requested web page document as recited in claims 9 and 32. Instead, Harada's proxy server retrieves profile information in order to augment the data request sent to the web server and then process the response (Abstract).

Second, applicant respectfully submits that Harada does not disclose, teach or suggest generating a secure resource URL for each resource URL referenced in the requested web page document, generating the requested web page document including

the secure resource URL(s) that can be used by the WAD to generate a request for each resource and transmitting the web page document including the secure resource URL(s) to the WAD as recited in claims 9 and 32. Instead, Harada provides an acceptable version of the web server's response to the client.

Finally and contrary to Harada, claims 9 and 32 recite that the WAD is actually seeking access to the resources, not merely the requested web page document. In other words, Harada does not disclose, teach or suggest a two stage process for the client to access the resources. Harada only discloses one stage – request 511 and response 516.

For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that Harada does not disclose, teach or suggest all the recited elements in claims 9 and 32. Moreover, applicant respectfully submits that Smith does not cure the deficiencies of Harada for the reasons set forth in the amendment dated September 20, 2007, which is hereby incorporated by reference. As a result, applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 32 are, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9 and 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 33-38

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 33-38 ultimately depend from claim 32, as amended, which is allowable for the reasons stated above, and further distinguish over the cited references. Claims 33-38 are, therefore, allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 33-38 be withdrawn.

[Left Blank Intentionally]

Appl. No. 09/922,209
Amdt. dated May 30, 2008
Reply to Office action of Nov. 30, 2007


Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration by the examiner and withdrawal of the rejections. Applicant submits that claims 9 and 32-38 are fully patentable. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the examiner has any questions or comments, or if further clarification is required, it is requested that the examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Date: May 30, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

CHALKER FLORES, LLP

By 

Daniel F. Chalker
Reg. No. 40,552
Tel.: (214) 866-0001
Fax: (214) 866-0010

2711 LBJ Freeway
Suite 1036
Dallas, Texas 75234